

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
GERTRUDE JEAN PIERRE,

Plaintiff,

-against-

MEMORANDUM & ORDER  
15-CV-3577 (JS) (ARL)

JULIANNE BONOMO, MADELINE SINGAS,

Defendants.

-----X  
APPEARANCES

For Plaintiff: Gertrude Jean Pierre, pro se  
P.O. Box 2066  
Garden City, NY 11531

For Defendants: No appearances.

SEYBERT, District Judge:

By Memorandum & Order ("M&O") dated January 26, 2016, the Court dismissed all claims brought by pro se plaintiff Gertrude Jean Pierre ("Plaintiff") against New York State, Nassau County District Judge Tricia Ferrell ("Judge Ferrell"), and the Nassau County District Attorney's Office with prejudice and dismissed Plaintiff's claims against Assistant District Attorney Julianne Bonomo ("ADA Bonomo") and Acting District Attorney Madeline Singas ("DA Singas") without prejudice and with leave to file an Amended Complaint within thirty (30) days from the date of the M&O. Plaintiff was cautioned that her failure to timely amend her Complaint would lead to the dismissal of her claims against ADA Bonomo and DA Singas with prejudice and this case will be marked closed.



To date, Plaintiff has not filed an Amended Complaint.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE for failure to allege a plausible claim for relief and pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

Although Plaintiff paid the filing fee in this Court, should she seek leave to appeal in forma pauperis, the Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and therefore in forma pauperis status is DENIED for the purpose of any appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45, 82 S. Ct. 917, 8 L. Ed. 2d 21 (1962).

The Clerk of the Court is directed to CLOSE this case and to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ JOANNA SEYBERT  
JOANNA SEYBERT, U.S.D.J.

Dated: May 17, 2016  
Central Islip, New York

---

<sup>1</sup> The only communication the Court has received from Plaintiff since the M&O is an incoherent letter dated February 16, 2016 in which she appears to indicate that she does not intend to pursue this case.